

Interview Summary

Application No. 09/575,060	Applicant(s) Babu et al.	
Examiner Celia Chang	Art Unit 1625	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Celia Chang (3) _____
(2) Kate Murashige (4) _____

Date of Interview Oct 9, 2003

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: 1-42 and 45-84

Identification of prior art discussed:

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

The examiner explained the prior art and the 112 issues as the prior art can be interpreted against the terms of the claims. Applicants would consider amending claims using unambiguous terms to demarcate from the art.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

**CELIA CHANG
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 1625**

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Celia Chang
Examiner's signature, if required